REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Specification/Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The specification/claims were objected to and rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicants have amended the specification and claims 1 and 8 to correct these grammatical informalities. No new matter is introduced by these amendments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections and rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nurmohamed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,725,818). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, an apparatus for inspecting errors that includes a comparing means for outputting a failure detection signal of the failed channel and that if the comparing means determines that the failed channel failed due to an instantaneous noise, the comparing means transmits an initialization signal to cancel the failure detection signal. In contrast, Nurmohamed merely discloses a voter circuit for a three channel redundant system. Specifically, Nurmohamed discloses that the circuit 16 detects a fault and outputs the fault to line 17 which triggers a switch (S1, S2A, or S3) to switch operation. See, for example, Figure 1 and the Abstract. Nurmohamed does not teach or suggest that a comparing means can determine whether the failed channel failed due to noise and can accordingly, cancel a failure detection signal.

Claim 1 also recites that the apparatus includes a signal-maintaining means for carrying out a feedback of a signal that is substantially similar to the signals of the other channels. As discussed above, Nurmohamed merely discloses a set of switches to switch, for example, channel 1 to channel 2. The switch merely removes channel 1 from operation, so the switch does not maintain the channel as recited in claim 1. Specifically, by maintaining, rather than switching, the channel, Applicants' claim 1 allows more than one channel to fail without effecting operation of the device. In contrast, Nurmohamed's device does not support the failure of more than one channel as evidenced by Figure 1.

Accordingly, Nurmohamed fails to teach or suggest an apparatus for inspecting

errors that includes a comparing means for outputting a failure detection signal of the failed channel and that if the comparing means determines that the failed channel failed due to an instantaneous noise, the comparing means transmits an initialization signal to cancel the failure detection signal and also includes a signal-maintaining means for carrying out a feedback of a signal that is substantially similar to the signals of the other channels, as recited in claim 1.

Claim 8 is believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 because claim 8 recites features similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above.

Claims 2-6 and 9-13 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 8 by virtue of their dependence upon claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

By:

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

Yoon S. Ham

Registration No. 45,307 Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group 1909 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006-1101 (202) 263-3000 Telephone (202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: June 6, 2005